

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-7, 10-11, 14, 17 and 21-30 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 17 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/019,685 of Lecoutre (“Lecoutre”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,741 of Chen et al. (“Chen”). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 relates to an image processing apparatus capable of providing a preview of an image. The image processing apparatus of claim 1 partially decodes and decompresses coded data to show a preview image corresponding to a post-quantization condition. With this preview functionality, a user can confirm the resultant image in advance (before a post-quantization process is actually performed based on the post-quantization condition set by the user).

More specifically, the partial decoding and decompression unit “partially decode[s] and decompress[es] coded data in accordance with the post-quantization condition set,” and “reproduce[s] an *image* (preview image) substantially identical to an

image (resultant image) which will be reproduced by decoding and decompressing the coded data that have been subjected to a post-quantization processing in accordance with the post-quantization condition” as recited in claim 1. The condition setting unit “arbitrarily set[s] a post-quantization,” and the image data displaying unit “display[s] the image reproduced by the partial decoding and decompression unit” as recited in claim 1.

Lecoutre does not teach or suggest the condition setting unit and the partial decoding and decompression unit of claim 1 as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Chen does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1 that are missing in Lecoutre. The partial decoding in Chen is not equivalent to the partial decoding in claim 1. The partial decoding of claim 1 is performed to reproduce a (preview) image substantially identical to a (resultant) image to be reproduced according to the post-quantization condition.

In contrast, the partial decoding of Chen is performed to convert a bit stream to another bit stream *itself*. When a pre-compressed 4:2:2 P bit stream is input, a 4:2:2 to 4:2:0 bit stream converter *partially decodes* the 4:2:2 bit stream and re-assembles the results *to provide* an MP bit stream, by representing a 4:2:2 picture in a 4:2:0 format. Chen does not disclose or suggest reproducing *another* image by partially decoding and

decompressing coded data, which corresponds to an MP bit stream, *i.e.*, the converted bit stream. In other words, Chen merely represents a 4:2:2 picture in a 4:2:0 format.

It should be noted that according to the features in claim 1, “it is possible for the user to easily set the most appropriate post-quantization condition while confirming in advance the results of post-quantization processing in accordance with various post-quantization conditions.” (par. [00185] of Applicants’ Specification) “Moreover, by performing post-quantization processing of coded data under the set post-quantization conditions, it is possible to adjust the compression rate without causing generation image degradation.” (Id.)

Because neither Lecoutre nor Chen nor a combination of Lecoutre and Chen discloses or suggests the partial decoding and decompression unit of claim 1, which “partially decode[s] and decompress[es] coded data in accordance with the post-quantization condition set,” and “reproduce[s] an image substantially identical to an image which will be reproduced by decoding and decompressing the coded data that have been subjected to a post-quantization processing in accordance with the post-quantization condition,” Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lecoutre and Chen has been overcome at least for this reason.

Claims 17 and 24 contain similar, but not identical, limitations as the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, at least for the reason stated above, Applicants respectfully

submit that the rejection of claims 17 and 24 in view of Lecoutre and Chen has been overcome.

Claims 2-16, 18-23 and 25-30 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 17 and 24, and thus, include the limitations set forth in their respective base claims. Therefore, at least for the reason discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2-16, 18-23 and 25-30 in view of Lecoutre and Chen has been overcome.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 13, 2008 _____ /Michael J. Mallie/
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94805-4040
(408) 720-8300